arXiv:1110.0639v2 [math.DG] 6 Sep 2012

A RIEMANNIAN DEFINITION OF QUASIREGULAR MAPPINGS

TONY LIIMATAINEN

Abstract. This article presents a new coordinate invariant definition of quasiregular and quasiconformal mappings on Riemannian manifolds. The definition generalizes the definition of quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and it arises naturally from the inner product structures on Riemannian manifolds. We establish the basic properties of the mappings satisfying the new definition and prove a natural convergence theorem for these mappings. These results are applied in a subsequent paper [16]. We also give an application of these results that demonstrates the usability of the new definition. We prove the existence of an invariant conformal structure for countable quasiconformal groups on general Riemannian manifolds. This result generalizes a result by Tukia [25] in the countable case.

1. Introduction

The standard analytic definition of a quasiregular mapping $\phi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n$, Ω open in $\mathbb{R}^n$, is given by the *distortion inequality*

$$||D\phi||_{op}^n \leq K J_\phi. \tag{1.1}$$

Here $D\phi$ is the differential of ϕ and

$$||D\phi||_{op} = \sup_{|X|=1} |(D\phi)X|$$

is its operator norm. The norms of the vectors are given by the Euclidean inner product and the *quasiconformality constant* K is assumed to be greater than or equal to 1. The natural regularity assumption is that the mapping ϕ belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{1,n}_{loc}(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and (1.1) is assumed to hold for the weak differential $D\phi$ of ϕ a.e. The (weak) Jacobian determinant $J_\phi = \det(D\phi)$ is assumed to be non-negative or non-positive a.e. on Ω [10, 21, 22, 26].

The definition generalizes to mappings between manifolds by declaring that the distortion inequality holds in local coordinate systems, but the quasiconformality constant K in the resulting definition depends on the chosen coordinates. The reason for the coordinate dependence is that the Jacobian determinant of a mapping depends not only on the point on the manifold, but also on the chosen coordinates.

Let us explain why the Jacobian determinant is coordinate dependent. The Jacobian matrix of a mapping depends on the coordinates of both the domain and target spaces. A coordinate transformation on either space accounts for multiplication of the Jacobian matrix of the mapping by the

---

Date: September 6, 2012.

coordinate transformation matrix, the differential of the transition function. Therefore, the Jacobian determinant of the mapping in the transformed coordinates depends also on the Jacobian determinant of the transition function illustrating the coordinate dependence.

The source of the coordinate dependence is that the differential $D\phi$ of a mapping $\phi : M \to N$ at a point $p \in M$ is a linear mapping between the different tangent spaces T_pM and $T_{\phi(p)}N$, while the determinant is defined basis independently only for linear mappings from a vector space to itself. As the tangent spaces of $\mathbb{R}^n$ can be identified, there is no inconsistency within the defining equation (1.1) on $\mathbb{R}^n$. For a mapping between manifolds a Jacobian determinant is usually defined by taking the pullback of the volume form on the target manifold. Using this approach, the Jacobian determinant can be viewed as an n-form on M with $n = \dim(M)$. We however use a slightly different approach (see Definition 1) where the Jacobian determinant of a mapping is simply a function on M.

The standard definition of quasiregular (or quasiconformal) mappings between manifolds uses coordinate charts whose transition functions are quasiconformal mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$. A collection of such coordinate charts, an atlas, is called a *quasiconformal structure*. In this case, a mapping is said to be quasiregular if (1.1) holds in all local coordinate charts for some finite K that can depend on the coordinates. This is the approach already mentioned. The definition is not coordinate invariant, but the qualitative condition that K is bounded is sufficient in many applications. This definition of quasiregularity has been successfully applied in the solutions of several problems; see e.g. [19, 2]. The definition also extends to topological manifolds which are not even C^1 smooth: except in dimension 4, quasiconformal structures can be found even for compact topological manifolds [10, 4].

The other common definition is the *metric definition* of quasiconformal mappings on metric spaces, which is valid also for Riemannian manifolds where distance functions are given by Riemannian metrics [22, 8]. We also mention the definition of quasiregular mappings between Riemannian spaces by Reshetnyak [21, Ch. I.5.]. His definition is closely related to the one we give.

We present a new *Riemannian definition of quasiregular mappings* for mappings between Riemannian manifolds that generalizes the $\mathbb{R}^n$ definition of quasiregular mappings. The mappings satisfying the new definition are called *Riemannian quasiregular mappings*. The definition is independent of the choice of local coordinates and uses the standard framework of tensor analysis. The freedom to make any choice of coordinates allows us to apply techniques and formulas from Riemannian geometry. This fact also establishes new connections to other branches in Riemannian geometry and to geometric analysis. See [15] for a first step in this direction. The freedom to work in arbitrary coordinates might be of practical interest also for the study of quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$.

The new definition of quasiregular mappings we give provides systematic and quantitative tools to study global questions in the theory of quasiregular mappings in Riemannian geometry. The coordinate dependent standard definition is less well-suited for some global problems where it is needed to use multiple coordinate charts. The metric definition is coordinate invariant, but our definition applies in problems that are analytic in nature. The defining distortion inequality of Riemannian quasiregular mappings is analogous to (1.1). We give an application of the theory we develop to global geometry. This is application is explained below.

The main subjects of this paper are the basic geometric and analytic properties of Riemannian quasiregular mappings. Theorem 3.4 illustrates the characteristic properties of Riemannian quasiregular mappings and implies that these mappings share the same analytic properties as the quasiregular mappings defined with respect to a quasiconformal structure. Theorem 3.6 is a natural convergence theorem for Riemannian quasiregular mappings. Some of the results we present are directed to be used in a subsequent paper that considers regularity of conformal mappings on Riemannian manifolds [16]. That paper presents a natural application of the theory we develop and can be considered as a partial motivation for this paper.

We present an application of geometric nature of the new definition. The application generalizes a result by Tukia concerning invariant conformal structures for quasiconformal groups [25]. We prove that every countable quasiconformal group on a Riemannian manifold admits an invariant conformal structure. Previously this result has been proven only for $\mathbb{R}^n$ and for n-spheres [25, 10]. By our definition, Tukia's result generalizes straightforwardly to general Riemannian manifolds. See also [15] for a recent related result.

To prove the existence of an invariant conformal structure for a quasiconformal group, one has to construct a fiber bundle over the manifold whose sections are conformal structures. The construction of this bundle is presented and we show that the bundle admits an elegant geometry. The geometry of the bundle is inherited form the natural geometry of the set $SL(n)/SO(n)$ of positive definite symmetric determinant one matrices.

2. A Riemannian definition of quasiregular mappings

The Riemannian definition of quasiregular and quasiconformal mappings is given via the Riemannian metrics on the manifolds.

Definition 1. Let $\phi : (M,g) \to (N,h)$ be a localizable $W^{1,n}_{loc}(M,N)$ mapping between Riemannian manifolds with continuous Riemannian metrics. In this case, the mapping ϕ is said to be *Riemannian K-quasiregular* if the Jacobian determinant of ϕ has locally constant sign and if it satisfies the distortion inequality

$$\operatorname{Tr}_g (\phi^* h)^n \le K^2 \operatorname{Det}_g (\phi^* h) \ \text{ a.e.} \tag{2.1}$$

If the mapping ϕ is in addition a homeomorphisms, then ϕ is called *Riemannian K-quasiconformal.*

Clarification of the details are in order. The *invariant normalized trace* Tr and the *invariant determinant* Det above for a general 2-covariant tensor field $T = (T_{ij}) \in T_0^2(M)$ are given in local coordinates by

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Tr}_g(T) &= \frac{1}{n} \operatorname{tr}\left(g^{-1}T\right) \\ \operatorname{Det}_g(T) &= \det\left(g^{-1}T\right). \end{aligned}$$

Here the trace and the determinant on the right hand sides are the usual ones for the matrix product $g^{-1}T$ of the representation matrices of g^{-1} and T with respect to any local frame and coframe. Occasionally we omit the subscript g from $\operatorname{Tr}_g(\cdot)$ and $\operatorname{Det}_g(\cdot)$ if the Riemannian metric used in the definition is clear from the context.

The Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(M,N)$ of mappings between Riemannian manifolds is usually defined by isometrically embedding the target manifold N to some $\mathbb{R}^k$, where k is large enough, and then defining

$$W^{1,p}(M,N) = \{u \in W^{1,p}(M,\mathbb{R}^k) : u(x) \in N \text{ a.e.}\}. \tag{2.2}$$

Here u is understood as the composition $E \circ \phi$, where $\phi : M \to N$ and E is an embedding of N to some $\mathbb{R}^k$, implicit in the definition. See [6, 7, 23, 24] for details about this definition. For our purposes the following simpler definition of Sobolev spaces is enough. This is because we assume that the mappings we consider are localizable.

A mapping ϕ is *localizable* if for every $p \in M$ there exist a neighborhood U of p and a coordinate neighborhood V of $\phi(p)$ such that $\phi(U)$ is compactly contained in V, $\phi(U) \subset\subset V$. If $p \in M$, and U and V are as described, the restriction $\phi : U \to V$ is called a *localization* of ϕ at p or simply a localization. Note that every continuous mapping is localizable. In fact, Riemannian quasiregular mapping can be redefined on sets of measure zero to continuous mappings (see Thm. 3.4). Therefore, we could have assumed that the mappings in the Definition 1 are continuous without any loss of generality.

The localizability of the mappings allows us to define Sobolev spaces in terms of local coordinate charts. We say that ϕ belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(M,N)$, $p > 1$, if the coordinate representation of every localization $\phi : U \to V$ is in the Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(U,V)$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Here U and V are identified with the images of U and V under coordinate charts. This is the definition of Sobolev spaces we use. We remark that the same definition of Sobolev spaces has also been used in the study of harmonic mappings between manifolds [13]. Local Sobolev spaces $W^{1,p}_{loc}(M,N)$ are defined in an analogous manner.

Assume that a mapping is localizable and that it belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(M,N)$ in the sense of (2.2). Then the mapping has the property that local coordinate representations of the mapping belong to $W^{1,p}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$. This follows from the fact that if U and $(V,\{y^i\})$ are as in the definition of localizability, we can write

$$\phi^i = y^i \circ \phi = (y^i \circ E^{-1}) \circ (E \circ \phi).$$

Therefore, ϕ^i is a function on an open subset U of $\mathbb{R}^n$ that belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(U,\mathbb{R})$ as a composition of a smooth and a Sobolev mapping; see e.g. [14, Thm. 6.16]. It follows that mappings belonging to the Sobolev space $W^{1,p}(M,N)$ in the sense of (2.2) satisfy the definition of Sobolev mappings we use.

We define the *weak differential* $D\phi$ of ϕ in terms of the weak differentials of the component functions of the coordinate representation of the localizations of ϕ. The chain rule of differentiation, valid for compositions of Sobolev and C^1 smooth mappings [21, Ch. I.2.5.], applied to the transition functions, shows that $D\phi$ is a well-defined bundle map $TM \to TN$ mapping each tangent space T_pM to $T_{\phi(p)}N$. The proof is the same as in the smooth case. Naturally, the weak differential is defined only modulo sets of measure zero. The (weak) pullback of the Riemannian metric h that appears in Definition 1 is defined with respect to the weak differential by the usual formula

$$\phi^* h = D\phi^T h|_\phi D\phi.$$

The Jacobian determinant of ϕ has *locally constant sign* if the Jacobian determinant of every coordinate representation of every localization is either non-negative or non-positive a.e.

We assume that the manifolds M and N are of equal dimension $n \geq 2$, oriented and C^1 smooth. The Riemannian metrics g and h are continuous unless otherwise stated. The measures μ_g and μ_h denote the measures defined by the Riemannian volume forms of g and h. These measures are equivalent (sets of measure zero are the same) to the ones constructed by pull-backing the Lebesgue measures on $\mathbb{R}^n$ by using local coordinates and partitions of unity. The equivalence is due to the continuity of g and h.

2.1. **Motivation.** Let us motivate the given definition of Riemannian quasiregular mappings. The initial motivation for the definition comes from the equation

$$\phi^* h = c\, g$$

defining conformal mappings on Riemannian manifolds. The conformal factor c can be solved from the equation in several ways. By taking the invariant normalized trace and the invariant determinant, one has

$$c = \mathrm{Tr}_g\left(\phi^* h\right) \text{ and } c^n = \mathrm{Det}_g\left(\phi^* h\right).$$

Equating the formulas for c yields

$$\mathrm{Tr}_g\left(\phi^* h\right)^n = \mathrm{Det}_g\left(\phi^* h\right).$$

A relaxation of this equality to an inequality with a factor $K^2 \geq 1$ gives the distortion inequality (2.1). A conformal mapping is 1-quasiregular, and the converse is also true as is shown in Proposition 3.1 (at least if the regularity properties are disregarded). The appearance of the square of K will become apparent later.

There is a geometrical way to interpret the definition of Riemannian quasiregular mappings. The tangent spaces of Riemannian manifolds M and N are equipped with inner products g and h. Thus the (weak) differential of ϕ at $p \in M$ is a linear mapping between inner product spaces,

$$D\phi : (T_pM, g_p) \to (T_{\phi(p)}N, h_{\phi(p)}).$$

It follows that there exists the (formal) adjoint

$$D\phi^* : (T_{\phi(p)}N, h_{\phi(p)}) \to (T_pM, g_p)$$

of $D\phi$ satisfying

$$g(D\phi^* U, V) = h_\phi(U, D\phi V),$$

for all $U \in T_{\phi(p)}N$ and $V \in T_pM$ at each point $p \in M$. Let us calculate the explicit form of the adjoint.

Let $p \in M$ and choose some local frames on neighborhoods of $p \in M$ and $\phi(p) \in N$. Let us denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ the standard Euclidean inner product of vectors. From the definition of the adjoint we have

$$\begin{aligned} g(D\phi^* U, V) &= h_\phi(U, D\phi V) = \langle U, h_\phi D\phi V\rangle = \langle (h_\phi D\phi)^T U, V\rangle \\ &= \langle D\phi^T (h_\phi)^T U, V\rangle = \langle D\phi^T h_\phi U, g^{-1} g V\rangle \\ &= \langle (g^{-1})^T D\phi^T h_\phi U, gV\rangle = g(g^{-1} D\phi^T h_\phi U, V). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the adjoint of $D\phi$ is

$$D\phi^* = g^{-1} D\phi^T h_\phi.$$

The normalized Hilbert-Schmidt inner product of linear mappings T and S between inner product spaces is given by

$$\langle T, S\rangle = \frac{1}{n} \mathrm{tr}\,(T^* S)\,.$$

The induced norm of the (normalized) Hilbert-Schmidt inner product applied to $D\phi$ now yields

$$||D\phi||^2 := \langle D\phi, D\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{n} \mathrm{tr}\left(g^{-1} D\phi^T h_\phi D\phi\right) = \mathrm{Tr}_g\,(\phi^* h)\,.$$

Thus the invariant normalized trace is the square of the normalized Hilbert-Schmidt norm of $D\phi : (TM, g) \to (TN, h)$. We also define yet another determinant as the square root of $\mathrm{Det}\,(\phi^* h)$,

$$\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi) := \sqrt{\det\,(D\phi^* D\phi)}.$$

Using what we have just observed, we give an equivalent definition of quasiregular mappings.

Definition 2. (Equivalent definition) A localizable mapping (homeomorphism) $\phi : (M, g) \to (N, h)$ of Sobolev class $W^{1,n}_{loc}(M, N)$ is K-quasiregular (K-quasiconformal) if the Jacobian determinant of ϕ has locally constant sign and if

$$||D\phi||^n \leq K\,\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi)\,.$$

Here $||D\phi||$ and $\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi)$ are the normalized Hilbert-Schmidt norm and the determinant of $D\phi$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned} ||D\phi|| &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sqrt{\mathrm{tr}\,(D\phi^* D\phi)} \\ \mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi) &= \sqrt{\det\,(D\phi^* D\phi)}. \end{aligned}$$

The definition is just the (positive) square root of Definition 1 of quasiregular mappings. It also explains the appearance of K squared in the first definition.

We have defined traces and determinants that we have claimed to be coordinate invariant. To see the invariance, note first that the mapping $D\phi^* D\phi$ is a mapping from T_pM to itself at each point $p \in M$. Also, a general $\binom{1}{1}$-tensor field can be regarded as a fiber preserving linear mapping $TM \to TM$. The trace and the determinant of linear mappings from a vector space to itself are independent of the choice of a basis. It follows that the defined traces and determinants of $D\phi$ and $g^{-1}\phi^* h$ and more generally for $\binom{2}{0}$-tensors fields are independent of the local framing. In particular, the definitions are independent of the choice of a local coordinate frame.

Remark. A $\binom{1}{1}$-tensor $g^{-1}T$, $T \in T^2_0(M)$, thought as a linear bundle map $TM \to TM$, has also a well defined eigenvalue equation

$$g^{-1}T(X) = \lambda X.$$

The coordinate independent eigenvalues that naturally depend on the point of the manifold are functions on M. The eigenvalues are solutions to the coordinate invariant equation

$$\mathrm{Det}\,(T - \lambda g) = \ \det\big(g^{-1}T - \lambda I\big) = 0. \tag{2.3}$$

We will use this fact to make calculations in arbitrary coordinates and local frames.

We end this section with an example that consider how the flow of a vector field generates distortion.

Example. Let X be a (say C^1) smooth vector field on (M, g). We study the quasiconformality of the flow ϕ_t generated by X by calculating the time derivative of the distortion function $K(t)$.

Define $g(t) = \phi_t^* g$. We take the traces and the determinants with respect to g unless otherwise indicated. Elementary calculations together with the identity

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathrm{Det}\,(g(t)) = \mathrm{Det}\,(g(t))\,\mathrm{Tr}_t\,(\dot g(t))$$

yield

$$\frac{d}{dt}K(t)^2 = \frac{d}{dt}\frac{\mathrm{Tr}\,(g(t))^n}{\mathrm{Det}\,(g(t))} = nK(t)^2\left(\frac{\mathrm{Tr}\,(\dot g(t))}{\mathrm{Tr}\,(g(t))} - \mathrm{Tr}_t\,(\dot g(t))\right).$$

We can write the equation above as

$$\dot K(t) = K(t)\frac{n/2}{\mathrm{Tr}\,(g(t))}\mathrm{Tr}\big(\dot g(t) - \mathrm{Tr}_t\,(\dot g(t))\,g(t)\big). \tag{2.4}$$

Let h be a Riemannian metric on M, let $T \in T^2_0(M)$ and let $||\cdot||_h$ denote the usual norm in the bundle $T \in T^2_0(M)$ induced by the Riemannian metric h, $||T||_h^2 = \mathrm{tr}\,\big(h^{-1}T^T h^{-1}T\big)$. The invariant trace of a $\binom{2}{0}$-tensor T satisfies an inequality

$$\mathrm{Tr}_g\,(T) \le \mathrm{Tr}_g\,(h)\,||T||_h.$$

To see this, use the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality for the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product of the representation matrices of g^{-1} and T in an h-orthonormal frame,

$$\begin{aligned} n\mathrm{Tr}_g\,(T) &= \mathrm{tr}\,\big(g^{-1}T\big) \le ||g^{-1}||_{HS}||T||_{HS} = \mathrm{tr}\,\big(g^{-2}\big)^{1/2}\,||T||_{HS} \\ &\le \mathrm{tr}\,\big(g^{-1}\big)\,||T||_{HS} = n\mathrm{Tr}_g\,(h)\,||T||_h. \end{aligned}$$

Applying this inequality with $h = g(t)$ to (2.4) gives

$$\dot{K}(t) \leq K(t)\frac{n}{2}||\dot{g}(t) - \mathrm{Tr}_t\left(\dot{g}(t)\right) g(t)||_{g(t)}.$$

The Riemannian inner product, its induced norm and the invariant trace of any tensor T behave naturally under pullbacks,

$$||T||_g|_\phi = ||\phi^* T||_{\phi^* g}, \quad \mathrm{Tr}_g\left(T\right)|_\phi = \mathrm{Tr}_{\phi^* g}\left(\phi^* T\right).$$

Also, the time derivative of $g(t)$ is the pullback by ϕ_t of the Lie derivative of g in the direction of X (cf. [3, p. 13]),

$$\dot{g}(t) = \phi_t^* \mathcal{L}_X g = \phi_t^* \dot{g}(0).$$

With these identities we can write

$$\begin{aligned} ||\dot{g}(t) - \mathrm{Tr}_t\left(\dot{g}(t)\right) g(t)||_{g(t)} &= ||\phi_t^* \mathcal{L}_X g - \mathrm{Tr}_{\phi_t^* g}\left(\phi_t^* \mathcal{L}_X g\right) \phi_t^* g||_{\phi_t^* g} \\ &= ||\mathcal{L}_X g - \mathrm{Tr}\left(\mathcal{L}_X g\right) g||_g|_{\phi_t} = ||SX||_g|_{\phi_t}. \end{aligned}$$

The notation SX refers to the Ahlfors operator S applied to X. The kernel of S defines conformal Killing vector fields [20]. Together with Grönwall's inequality we see that the quasiconformality constant under the flow of the vector field X is controlled by the supremum g-norm of SX:

$$K(t) \leq \exp\left(tn||SX||_\infty/2\right).$$

The flow of X is a family of $K(t)$-quasiconformal mappings with $K(t)$ given above. We have recovered an analogous result to the one given in [20].

3. Basic properties of quasiregular mappings

The definition of Riemannian quasiregular mappings is natural in the Riemannian setting and generalizes the standard definition of quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$. To compare the new definition with the standard definition of quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$, let the manifolds in the defining equation (2.1) be Euclidean domains in $\mathbb{R}^n$ with Cartesian coordinates. In Cartesian coordinates the Euclidean metrics g and h are the identity matrices I. We have

$$\frac{1}{n}||D\phi||_1^2 \leq \frac{1}{n}||D\phi||_{HS}^2 = \frac{1}{n}\mathrm{tr}\left(D\phi^* D\phi\right) = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\phi^* h\right) = \frac{1}{n}||D\phi||_{HS}^2 \leq ||D\phi||_1^2,$$

where we have denoted the operator norm and the (unnormalized) Hilbert-Schmidt norm by $||\cdot||_1$ and $||\cdot||_{HS}$ respectively. Moreover, the right hand side of the distortion inequality (2.1), for $g = h = I$, now reads

$$K^2\, \mathrm{Det}\left(\phi^* h\right) = K^2\, \det\left(D\phi\right)^2.$$

Together these show that a K-quasiregular mapping on $\mathbb{R}^n$ in the standard sense (as defined by (1.1)) is a Riemannian quasiregular mapping with the same quasiregularity factor K.

On the contrary, a Riemannian K-quasiregular mapping between Euclidean domains on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a $n^{n/2}K$-quasiregular mapping in the standard sense. The quasiregularity constant $n^{n/2}K$ in this case is not the best one in general. For example, 1-quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$ are 1-quasiregular in both new and old definitions. This can be seen from the next proposition below. The difference in the quasiregularity constants on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is an effect of the different norm used for the differential of the mapping.

We call the $\binom{1}{1}$-tensor $g^{-1}\phi^* h$ the *distortion tensor*, which is the (unnormalized) generalization of that used in the theory of quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$ [10, p.100]. It is worth noting that the distortion tensor has non-negative coordinate invariant eigenvalues for any (weakly differentiable) mapping $\phi : (M, g) \to (N, h)$. The coordinate invariance of the eigenvalues follows from the remark of the previous section. The eigenvalues are thus functions on M, and, if the mapping is assumed to be of Sobolev class $W^{1,n}_{loc}(M, N)$, the eigenvalues belong to $L^{n/2}_{loc}(M)$ due to the inequality

$$\lambda \leq \operatorname{tr}\left(g^{-1}\phi^* h\right) \in L^{n/2}_{loc}(M).$$

When the mapping ϕ is K-quasiregular, the ratio of the maximum and minimum eigenvalue is in addition bounded a.e. by $n^n K^2$:

$$K^2 \geq \operatorname{Tr}(\phi^* h)^n / \operatorname{Det}(\phi^* h) = \frac{1}{n^n}\left(\sum_i \lambda_i\right)^n / \prod_i \lambda_i \geq \frac{1}{n^n}\frac{\lambda_{\max}}{\lambda_{\min}}. \tag{3.1}$$

If ϕ is conformal, the only eigenvalue of the distortion tensor is the conformal factor c of the mapping with multiplicity n.

Proposition 3.1. A non-constant Riemannian 1-quasiregular mapping $\phi : (M, g) \to (N, h)$ is conformal,

$$\phi^* h = cg \text{ a.e.},$$

for some positive function c. Here $\phi^* h$ is defined by the weak differential of ϕ.

Proof. It suffices to prove the claim locally. Any local matrix representation of $g^{-1}\phi^* h$ has positive eigenvalues λ_i a.e. This follows from the fact that $J_\phi \neq 0$ a.e. by Theorem 3.4 and therefore $g^{-1}\phi^* h$ is a product of symmetric positive definite matrices a.e.

The inequality of arithmetic and geometric means shows that the function

$$\operatorname{Tr}(\phi^* h)^n - \operatorname{Det}(\phi^* h) = \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^n (\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n)^n - \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n \tag{3.2}$$

has a minimum 0 for positive λ_i. This happens exactly when all the λ_i's coincide, $\lambda_i = \lambda$. Now, the condition of 1-quasiregularity yields

$$\operatorname{Tr}(\phi^* h)^n \leq \operatorname{Det}(\phi^* h) = \lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n \leq \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^n (\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n)^n = \operatorname{Tr}(\phi^* h)^n .$$

Accordingly, the minimum of the function in (3.2) is achieved, and we have

$$g^{-1}\phi^* h = A^T \Lambda A = \lambda \operatorname{Id} \text{ a.e.}$$

Here A is the diagonalizing orthogonal matrix field of the local coordinate representation of $g^{-1}\phi^* h$. The matrix Λ is the diagonal matrix, which has the eigenvalue λ (of multiplicity n) as the diagonal entries. ☐

The definition of Riemannian quasiregular mappings can also be interpreted as a definition of quasiconformal metrics by inserting $\phi = \operatorname{Id}$ into the definition. We say that two Riemannian metrics g and h are *quasiconformally related* if the relation

$$\mathrm{Tr}_g\,(h)^n \leq K^2\,\mathrm{Det}_g\,(h)$$

holds for some constant $K \geq 1$.

The quasiconformality relation, which we denote by $\sim$, is an equivalence relation in the set of Riemannian metrics. This is shown in the proposition below. We write $\mathcal{M}$ for the set of all Riemannian metrics on M with no prescribed regularity properties and $\mathrm{Map}(M, \mathbb{R})$ denotes the general space of functions on M.

Definition 3. The *distortion function* K^2 is the function $\mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \to \mathrm{Map}(M, \mathbb{R})$,

$$K^2(g,h)(p) = \frac{\mathrm{Tr}_g\,(h)^n}{\mathrm{Det}_g\,(h)}(p).$$

We record for future reference that for any mapping $\phi : M \to N$ the distortion function satisfies

$$K^2(\phi^* h, \phi^* k) = K^2(h,k)|_\phi \tag{3.3}$$

at the points where the (weak) Jacobian matrix of ϕ is invertible. Here h and k are arbitrary Riemannian metrics on N. This fact is essentially a statement of the coordinate invariance of K^2.

Note that a mapping satisfies the distortion inequality (2.1) exactly when the distortion function applied to g and $\phi^* h$ is bounded on M. The distortion function is invariant under conformal scaling of either or both the metrics g and h implying that the notion of quasiregularity is naturally conformally invariant.

For the distortion function we have the following.

Proposition 3.2. The distortion function $K^2 : \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \to \mathrm{Map}(M, \mathbb{R})$ of Riemannian metrics on M has the following properties:

(1) For $g, h, k \in \mathcal{M}$ the distortion function satisfies

$$K^2(g,k) \leq n^n K^2(g,h) K^2(h,k) \tag{3.4}$$

and

$$K^2(g,h) \leq K^2(h,g)^{n-1}. \tag{3.5}$$

(2) The quasiconformality relation $\sim$ is an equivalence relation on $\mathcal{M}$.

Proof. Let g, k and h be Riemannian metrics on M. We have

$$\begin{aligned} K^2(g,k)^{1/n} &= \frac{1}{n} \frac{\mathrm{tr}\left(g^{-1}k\right)}{\det\left(g^{-1}k\right)^{1/n}} = \frac{1}{n} \frac{\mathrm{tr}\left(g^{-1}hh^{-1}k\right)}{\det\left(g^{-1}hh^{-1}k\right)^{1/n}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \frac{\mathrm{tr}\left(g^{-1}h\right)\mathrm{tr}\left(h^{-1}k\right)}{\det\left(g^{-1}h\right)^{1/n}\ \det\left(h^{-1}k\right)^{1/n}} = nK^2(g,h)^{1/n} K^2(h,k)^{1/n}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact that trace is submultiplicative for a product of positive definite matrices. We have (3.4).

To prove (3.5), we use some standard matrix results. The adjugate matrix $\mathrm{Adj}(A)$ of an invertible matrix A satisfies

$$A^{-1} = \frac{\mathrm{Adj}(A)}{\det(A)}.$$

The fact that a symmetric positive definite matrix A has a symmetric square root, applied to a norm estimate

$$||\mathrm{Adj}(A)||_{HS} \leq n^{-(n-2)/2}||A||_{HS}^{n-1}$$

of the adjugate matrix (see e.g. [18]), yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{tr}\,(\mathrm{Adj}(A)) &= \mathrm{tr}\left((\mathrm{Adj}(A))^{T/2}(\mathrm{Adj}(A))^{1/2}\right) = \mathrm{tr}\left((\mathrm{Adj}(A^{1/2}))^{T}\mathrm{Adj}(A^{1/2})\right) \\ &= ||\mathrm{Adj}(A^{1/2})||_{HS}^{2} \leq n^{-(n-2)}||A^{1/2}||_{HS}^{2(n-1)} \\ &= n^{2-n}\mathrm{tr}\left(A^{T/2}A^{1/2}\right)^{n-1} = n^{2-n}\mathrm{tr}\,(A)^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $||\cdot||_{HS}$ denotes the Hilbert-Schmidt norm. Applying the above formulas for $A = h^{-1}g$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} K^2(g,h) &= \frac{1}{n^n}\frac{\mathrm{tr}\left(g^{-1}h\right)^n}{\det\left(g^{-1}h\right)} = \frac{1}{n^n}\frac{\mathrm{tr}\left(A^{-1}\right)^n}{\det\left(A^{-1}\right)} = \frac{1}{n^n}\frac{1}{\det\left(A\right)^n}\frac{\mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{Adj}(A)\right)^n}{\det\left(A^{-1}\right)} \\ &\leq n^{-n}n^{n(2-n)}\frac{(\mathrm{tr}\,(A)^{n-1})^n}{\det\left(A\right)^{n-1}} = n^{-n+n(2-n)+n(n-1)}\left(\frac{(\frac{1}{n}\mathrm{tr}\,(A))^n}{\det\left(A\right)}\right)^{n-1} \\ &\leq K^2(h,g)^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The fact that the quasiconformality relation $\sim$ is an equivalence relation follows. ☐

We now return to the study of Riemannian quasiregular mappings. Previously we found that Riemannian quasiregular mappings between Euclidean spaces are quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and vice versa. On $\mathbb{R}^n$ the new and the standard definition of quasiregularity are equivalent.

Next we consider a local version of this equivalence for general Riemannian manifolds. We show that if $\phi : (M,g) \to (N,h)$ is Riemannian quasiregular, then for any $p \in M$ there is a localization of ϕ at p such that the coordinate representation (of the localization) is quasiregular mapping on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The quasiregularity constant of the coordinate representation will depend on K and on the coordinate representations of the Riemannian metrics g and h.

Theorem 3.3. *Let ϕ be Riemannian K-quasiregular mapping between Riemannian manifolds (M,g) and (N,h). Then, for any $p \in M$, there is a localization of ϕ at p such that the coordinate representation of the localization is a quasiregular mapping on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The quasiregularity constant $\overline{K}$ of the localization depends only on K and on the coordinate representations of g on U and h on V.*

Proof. Let $p \in M$. Choose coordinate neighborhoods (U,ψ) and (V,φ) around p and $\phi(p)$ such that $\phi(U) \subset\subset V$. The coordinate representation of ϕ is of Sobolev class $W^{1,n}_{loc}(U,V)$. By the continuity of g and h we have

$$K(\psi^* I, g) \leq K_1 \text{ on } U \text{ and } K(h, \varphi^* I) \leq K_2 \text{ on } V.$$

It is sufficient to show that the distortion of the coordinate representation $\varphi \circ \phi \circ \psi^{-1} : U \to V$ of ϕ with respect to Euclidean metrics is bounded. By (3.3) and (3.4) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &K^2(I, (\varphi \circ \phi \circ \psi^{-1})^* I) \le n^{2n} K^2(I, (\psi^{-1})^* g) \\ &\quad \times K^2((\psi^{-1})^* g, (\phi \circ \psi^{-1})^* h)\, K^2((\phi \circ \psi^{-1})^* h, (\varphi \circ \phi \circ \psi^{-1})^* I) \\ &\quad = n^{2n} K^2(\psi^* I, g)|_{\psi^{-1}} K^2(g, \phi^* h) K^2(h, \varphi^* I)|_{\phi\circ\psi^{-1}} \le n^{2n} K_1^2 K^2 K_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used (3.3) and the chain rule of differentiation, valid for compositions of C^1 smooth and Sobolev mappings (see e.g. [14]), to deduce that

$$(\varphi \circ \phi \circ \psi^{-1})^* I = (\phi \circ \psi^{-1})^* \varphi^* I.$$

□

We are now ready to state the basic properties of Riemannian quasiregular mappings. The following theorem considers mostly the analytic properties of quasiregular mappings, which all follow from the well-known corresponding statements of quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The theorem in particularly states that the standard formulas for derivatives and integration of smooth mappings are valid a.e. for Riemannian quasiregular and Riemannian quasiconformal mappings.

Theorem 3.4. Let a mapping $\phi : (M, g) \to (N, h)$ be Riemannian K-quasiregular and assume that g and h are continuous. Then the following hold:

(1) The mapping ϕ is differentiable a.e., and at the points where the differential exists, it coincides with the weak differential. The mapping ϕ can be redefined on a set of measure zero to be continuous.

(2) Let $u \in W^{1,n}_{loc}(N)$. Then $\phi^* u = u \circ \phi$ is of Sobolev class $W^{1,n}_{loc}(N)$ and $\phi^* u$ satisfies a.e. the chain rule of derivation:

$$\partial_i (u \circ \phi) = \partial_a u|_\phi \partial_i \phi^a \text{ i.e. } d\phi^* u = \phi^* du. \tag{3.6}$$

Moreover,

$$|d(u \circ \phi)|_g^n \le n^n K \operatorname{Det}(D\phi)\, \phi^*(|du|_h^n) \text{ a.e.}$$

(3) If the mapping ϕ is non-constant (and redefined to be continuous), then it is open and discrete. The Riemannian Jacobian determinant

$$\operatorname{Det}(D\phi) = \sqrt{\det(g^{-1}\phi^* h)} \in L^1_{loc}(M)$$

of ϕ is non-vanishing a.e. in this case.

(4) If $\psi : (N, h) \to (L, k)$ is another Riemannian quasiregular mapping, with quasiregularity factor K', then the composition $\psi \circ \phi$ is $n^{n/2} K' K$-quasiregular. Moreover, the chain rule holds for the differential of the composition:

$$D(\psi \circ \phi) = D\psi|_\phi \circ D\psi \text{ a.e.} \tag{3.7}$$

In particular, we have

$$(\psi \circ \phi)_* U = \psi_* \phi_* U \text{ and } (\psi \circ \phi)^* T = \phi^* \psi^* T \tag{3.8}$$

holding a.e. for any vector (field) U of M and covariant tensor (field) T of L.

(5) If ϕ is in addition a homeomorphism, and thus K-quasiconformal, its inverse is K^{n-1}-quasiconformal. Also, integration by substitution is valid:

$$\int_M f \circ \phi \, \mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi)\, d\mu_g = \int_N f d\mu_h.$$

Here f is any integrable function on N.

Proof. Since ϕ is localizable, we can choose atlases $\{U_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{V_\beta\}_{\beta\in\mathbb{N}}$ of M and N such that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi(U_\alpha) \subset\subset V_\beta$. For any α and a corresponding β, the coordinate representation of the restriction $\phi_{\alpha\beta} : U_\alpha \to V_\beta$ is a quasiregular mapping on $\mathbb{R}^n$ by the previous proposition.

(1) − (3): With respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^n$, the coordinate representation $\phi_{\alpha\beta}$ is differentiable a.e., and, at the points where the differential exists, the differential coincides with the weak differential [21, p. 84].

Each localization of ϕ can be redefined on a set of measure zero such that the resulting localization is continuous [10, Ch. 7]. The redefinitions made in different local coordinates agree: Let ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 be continuous redefinitions of ϕ on U_1 and U_2 with $U_1 \cap U_2 \neq \emptyset$. Assume that there exists $q \in U_1 \cap U_2$ such that $\phi_1(q) \neq \phi_2(q)$,

$$|\phi_1(q) - \phi_2(q)| = \epsilon > 0.$$

Here $|\cdot|$ is the Euclidean norm in coordinates. There is a neighborhood U of q such that

$$|\phi_1(q) - \phi_1(p)| < \epsilon/2 \text{ and } |\phi_2(q) - \phi_2(p)| < \epsilon/2$$

for all $p \in U$. Since ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 agree a.e., there exists $p' \in U$ with $\phi_1(p') = \phi_2(p')$. We have

$$|\phi_1(q) - \phi_2(q)| \leq |\phi_1(q) - \phi_1(p')| + |\phi_2(p') - \phi_2(q)| < \epsilon,$$

which is a contradiction.

If ϕ is non-constant and continuous, then it is open and discrete; see e.g. [22]. The Jacobian determinant of $\phi_{\alpha\beta}$ is non-vanishing a.e. in this case [10, Thm. 16.10.1]. The chain rule holds by [10, Thm. 16.13.3].

Let us denote by $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ the standard inner product of vectors in $\mathbb{R}^n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |d(u\circ\phi)|_g^2 &= \langle D\phi^T du|_\phi, g^{-1}D\phi^T du|_\phi\rangle = \langle du|_\phi, h^{-1}|_\phi(h|_\phi D\phi g^{-1}D\phi^T)du|_\phi\rangle \\ &\leq \mathrm{tr}\left(D\phi g^{-1}D\phi^T h|_\phi\right)|du|_h^2 \circ \phi = \mathrm{tr}\left(g^{-1}\phi^* h\right)|du|_h^2\circ\phi \\ &\leq n^{n/2}K^{2/n}\mathrm{Det}_g\left(\phi^*h\right)^{1/n}|du|_h^2\circ\phi. \end{aligned}$$

In the second line we have used the fact that the matrix $h|_\phi D\phi g^{-1}D\phi^T$ has positive eigenvalues a.e. We have proven (1) − (3).

(4): First we have to show that the composition $\psi\circ\phi$ is localizable. Let $p \in M$. By the definition of the localizability there exist an open neighborhood V of $\phi(p)$ and a coordinate neighborhood $(W, \{z^i\})$ containing $\psi(\phi(p))$ such that $\psi(V) \subset\subset W$. Since ϕ can be assumed continuous by part (1), we have that $U := \phi^{-1}(V)$ is open. Thus $\psi\circ\phi$ maps a neighborhood U

of p into a coordinate neighborhood W of $\psi(\phi(p))$ with $(\psi\circ\phi)(U)\subset\subset W$. That $\psi\circ\phi$ has locally constant sign follows from chain rule (3.6).

By the definition of the Sobolev space $W^{1,n}_{loc}(M,N)$, the component mapping $\psi^i = z^i\circ\psi$ is of Sobolev class $W^{1,n}_{loc}(V)$. By part (2) of this theorem, the composition $\psi^i\circ\phi$ belongs to the Sobolev space $W^{1,n}_{loc}(U)$ and satisfies

$$\partial_j(\psi^i\circ\phi) = \partial_k\psi^i|_\phi\,\partial_j\phi^k \text{ a.e.}$$

It follows that $\psi\circ\phi\in W^{1,n}_{loc}(M,L)$ and that the chain rule holds a.e. The pushforward and pullback formulas are consequences of the chain rule.

The distortion inequality follows from

$$\begin{aligned}K^2(g,(\psi\circ\phi)^*k) &\le n^nK^2(g,\phi^*h)K^2(\phi^*h,\phi^*\psi^*k)\\ &\le n^nK^2K^2(h,\psi^*k)|_\phi \le n^nK^2(K')^2\end{aligned}$$

holding a.e. Here we have applied the pullback formula (3.8) with $T=k$, the inequality (3.4), and the fact that the Jacobian determinant of ϕ is non-vanishing a.e. The latter implies that (3.3) holds a.e.

(5): The inverse of ϕ is localizable as a continuous mapping. From the theory of quasiconformal mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$ it follows that the inverse is of Sobolev class $W^{1,n}_{loc}(N,M)$; see e.g. [21, p.215]. We use Proposition 3.2 to calculate the distortion of ϕ^{-1}:

$$\begin{aligned}K^2(h,\phi^{-1*}g) &= \frac{\mathrm{Tr}_h\left(\phi^{-1*}g\right)^n}{\mathrm{Det}_h\left(\phi^{-1*}g\right)} = \frac{\mathrm{tr}\left(h^{-1}D(\phi^{-1})^Tg|_\phi D(\phi^{-1})\right)}{\det\left(h^{-1}D(\phi^{-1})^Tg|_\phi D(\phi^{-1})\right)}\\ &= \left.\frac{\mathrm{tr}\left((D\phi^Th|_\phi D\phi)^{-1}g\right)}{\det\left((D\phi^Th|_\phi D\phi)^{-1}g\right)}\right|_{\phi^{-1}} = K(\phi^*h,g)|_{\phi^{-1}}\\ &\le K^2(h,\phi^*g)^{n-1}|_{\phi^{-1}} \le (K^2)^{n-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the chain rule (3.6) for the composition of a $W^{1,n}_{loc}$ mapping ϕ^{-1} and the quasiconformal mapping ϕ together with the fact that the Jacobian determinant of ϕ is non-vanishing a.e. to deduce that

$$(D\phi)^{-1} = (D\phi^{-1})|_\phi \text{ a.e.}$$

We conclude that ϕ^{-1} is quasiconformal.

For the integration by substitution formula we choose a partition of unity subordinate to $\{U_\alpha\}$ and apply [21, p.99]. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_M f\circ\phi\,\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi)\,d\mu_g &= \sum_\alpha\int_{U_\alpha}\varphi_\alpha\,f\circ\phi\,|J_\phi|\,\det(h)\,|_\phi^{1/2}dx^n\\ =\sum_\alpha\int_{\phi(U_\alpha)} f\varphi_\alpha\circ\phi^{-1}\,\det(h)^{1/2}\,dy^n &= \int_N fd\mu_h.\end{aligned}$$

□

3.1. **Convergence theorem.** We continue with a convergence theorem for Riemannian quasiregular mappings. For this, we first define a natural topology for Riemannian quasiregular mappings.

For quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$ the natural topologies are the weak Sobolev $W^{1,n}_{loc}$ topology and the compact-open topology. A sequence of K-quasiregular mappings converging in either of these topologies converge to a quasiregular mapping [10, 22] with the same quasiregularity factor K. The analogue of (weak) $W^{1,n}_{loc}$ convergence of mappings in $W^{1,n}(M,N)$ we use is the following.

Definition 4. A sequence $\{\phi_i\}$ of Sobolev $W^{1,n}(M,N)$ mappings *converge (weakly)* to $\phi : M \to N$ in $W^{1,n}(M,N)$ if ϕ is localizable and if for any localization $\phi : U \to V$ there is N_U such that

$$\phi_i(U) \subset\subset V$$

for all $i \geq N_U$ and $\phi_i : U \to V$ converge (weakly) to $\phi : U \to V$ in $W^{1,n}(U,V)$. The convergence in $W^{1,n}_{loc}(M,N)$ is defined analogously.

As the definition above suggests, to infer additional properties for the limit mapping ϕ we must a priori know that the sequence and the limit mapping can be localized simultaneously. Therefore we introduce the following concept. We call a sequence $\{\phi_i\}$ of mappings $M \to N$ *uniformly localizable* with respect to a mapping $\phi : M \to N$ if ϕ is localizable and if for any localization $\phi : U \to V$ there is $N_U \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\phi_i(U) \subset\subset V$ for $i \geq N_U$.

Let d and e be the distance metrics induced by the continuous Riemannian metrics g and h on M and N. It is well known that for smooth Riemannian metrics the topologies induced by d and e coincide with the original topologies of the manifolds. The same is true also for continuous Riemannian metrics. This can be seen from the proof of this fact in the smooth case presented in [1, Thm. 1.18]. We have the following.

Lemma 3.5. Let $\{\phi_i\}$ be a sequence of continuous mappings $(M,d) \to (N,e)$ converging uniformly on compact sets to $\phi : M \to N$. Then $\{\phi_i\}$ is uniformly localizable with respect to ϕ.

Proof. By the uniform convergence, the limit mapping ϕ is continuous and thus localizable. Let $p \in M$ and choose a neighborhood U of p and a coordinate neighborhood V of $\phi(p)$such that $\phi(U) \subset\subset V$. Choose $\delta > 0$ such that

$$e(\phi(x), \phi(p)) \leq D/4$$

if $x \in \overline{B}(p,\delta)$. Here D is the distance $\mathrm{dist}_e(\phi(p), \partial V)$. Since $\phi_i \to \phi$ uniformly on $\overline{B}(p,\delta)$, we can choose an integer N such that

$$e(\phi_i(x), \phi(x)) \leq D/4$$

for all $x \in \overline{B}(p,\delta)$ and $i \geq N$. Now, let $x \in B(p,\delta)$ and let $i \geq N$. We have

$$e(\phi_i(x), \phi(p)) \leq e(\phi_i(x), \phi(x)) + e(\phi(x), \phi(p)) \leq D/2.$$

□

As noted before, a sequence of K-quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$ converging weakly in $W^{1,n}_{loc}$ converges to a K-quasiregular mapping [10]. It is also a fact that a sequence of quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$ converging uniformly on compact sets converges weakly on $W^{1,n}_{loc}$ [22]. These remarks together with the previous lemma allow us to prove a natural convergence theorem for Riemannian quasiregular mappings.

Theorem 3.6. Let a sequence $\{\phi_i\}$ of Riemannian K-quasiregular mappings $(M, g, d) \to (N, h, e)$ converge uniformly on compact sets to ϕ. Then ϕ is Riemannian K-quasiregular.

Proof. Since Riemannian quasiregular mappings are continuous, ϕ is localizable by the previous lemma. Let $p \in M$ and let $\phi : U \to V$ be a localization of ϕ at p. Applying the previous lemma again, we may assume without loss of generality that $\overline{U}$ is compact and that $\phi(U), \phi_i(U) \subset\subset V$.

Let us first show that $\phi : U \to V$ is of Sobolev class $W^{1,n}_{loc}(U, V)$. The coordinate representations of ϕ_i are $\overline{K}$-quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$ (by Thm. 3.3) converging uniformly on compact sets to the coordinate representation of $\phi : U \to V$. It follows from the proof of Theorem 8.6 in [22] that the coordinate representations converge weakly in $W^{1,n}(U, V)$ to a $\overline{K}$-quasiregular mapping on $\mathbb{R}^n$. Thus $\phi \in W^{1,n}(U, V)$, and since U was arbitrary, we have $\phi \in W^{1,n}_{loc}(M, N)$.

By passing to a subsequence we may assume that either $J_{\phi_i} \geq 0$ or $J_{\phi_i} \leq 0$ a.e. on U for all i. We may further assume the first condition, $J_{\phi_i} \geq 0$ a.e. on U for all i, for the proof of the other case is analogous. Since the limit mappings $\phi : U \to V$ is quasiregular on $\mathbb{R}^n$ we have $J_\phi \geq 0$ a.e. on U. It follows that J_ϕ has locally constant sign.

It remains to show that the distortion inequality

$$||D\phi||^n \leq K \,\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi)$$

holds a.e. for the localization $\phi : U \to V$. We prove this by modifying the proof of the analogous theorem for quasiregular mappings on $\mathbb{R}^n$ [10, Thm. 8.7.1.]. We begin by showing the lower semicontinuity of the operator norm,

$$\int_U ||D\phi||^n dx \leq \liminf_i \int_U ||D\phi_i||^n dx. \tag{3.9}$$

We use a modification of a standard argument [14, Thm. 2.11]. Let us first show that the weak convergence of $D\phi_i$ in $L^n(U)$ implies that $(h \circ \phi_i)^{1/2} D\phi_i$ converges weakly to $(h \circ \phi)^{1/2} D\phi$ in $L^n(U)$.

Let $\psi \in L^n(U)^*$ and denote $k_i = (h \circ \phi_i)^{1/2}$ and $k = (h \circ \phi)^{1/2}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \int_U \psi k_i D\phi_i - \int_U \psi k D\phi \right| &\leq \left| \int_U \psi (k_i - k) D\phi_i + \int_U \psi k (D\phi_i - D\phi) \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int_U \psi (k_i - k) D\phi_i \right| + \left| \int_U \psi k (D\phi_i - D\phi) \right| \\
&\leq ||k_i - k||_{C(U)} \int_U |\psi||D\phi_i| + \left| \int_U \psi k (D\phi_i - D\phi) \right| \\
&\leq ||k_i - k||_{C(U)} \left(\int_U |\psi|^{n/(n-1)} \right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \left(\int_U |D\phi_i|^n \right)^{\frac{1}{n}} \\
&\quad + \left| \int_U \psi k (D\phi_i - D\phi) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Here the norms $|\cdot|$ are understood as the Hilbert-Schmidt norms where applicable. We have used Hölder's inequality in the ultimate inequality. Since $k_i \to k$ uniformly and the weakly convergent sequence $D\phi_i$ is bounded, we conclude that $k_i D\phi_i \to kD\phi$ weakly in $L^n(U)$.

To simplify the following argument, let us now denote $h_i = h \circ \phi_i$ and, with a slight abuse of notation, let us also denote $h = h \circ \phi$. Consider the linear functional L on the space of L^n integrable $n \times n$ matrices $L^n(U, \mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$ defined by

$$L(T) = \int_U ||D\phi||^{n-2}\mathrm{tr}\left(g^{-1}D\phi^T h^{1/2} T\right),$$

where $T \in L^n(U, \mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$. Since $||D\phi||^{n-2} g^{-1} h^{1/2} \in L^{n/(n-1)}(U, \mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$, the dual of $L^n(U, \mathbb{R}^{n\times n})$, the functional L is continuous by Hölder's inequality. By the weak convergence of $(h \circ \phi_i)^{1/2} D\phi_i$ we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_U ||D\phi||^n &= \lim L(h_i^{1/2} D\phi_i) = \lim \int_U ||D\phi||^{n-2}\mathrm{tr}\left(g^{-1}D\phi^T h^{1/2} h_i^{1/2} D\phi_i\right) \\ &\le \liminf \int_U ||D\phi||^{n-2}\mathrm{tr}\left(g^{-1}D\phi^T h D\phi\right)^{1/2}\mathrm{tr}\left(g^{-1}D\phi_i^T h_i D\phi_i\right)^{1/2} \\ &= \liminf \int_U ||D\phi||^{n-1}||D\phi_i|| \\ &\le \left(\int_U ||D\phi||^n\right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}} \liminf \left(\int_U ||D\phi_i||^n\right)^{\frac{1}{n}}.\end{aligned}$$

Here in the second line we have used the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality for the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product of matrices and in the last line we have used Hölder's inequality. Diving by

$$\left(\int_U ||D\phi||^n\right)^{\frac{n-1}{n}}$$

shows the lower semicontinuity of the operator norm (3.9). We also note for later use that the same argument applies if we multiply both of the integrands of the inequality (3.9) by any positive test function.

We show next that, for any positive test function $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(U) = \mathcal{D}$, we have

$$\int_U \varphi\,\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi_i) \to \int_U \varphi\,\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi). \tag{3.10}$$

Since $J_{\phi_i} \ge 0$ a.e. on U, we have $\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi_i) = \det\left(g^{-1}h|_{\phi_i}\right)^{1/2} J_{\phi_i}$. The sequence $\det\left(g^{-1}h|_{\phi_i}\right) \in C(U)$ converges to $\det\left(g^{-1}h|_{\phi}\right)$ uniformly on U. For simplicity, let us denote $a_i = \det\left(g^{-1}h|_{\phi_i}\right)^{1/2}$ and $a = \det\left(g^{-1}h|_{\phi}\right)^{1/2}$. We have $J_{\phi_i} \to J_\phi$ in $\mathcal{D}'$ by [10, Thm. 8.2.1]. It follows that

$$\int_U \varphi\, J_\phi, \int_U \varphi\, J_{\phi_i} < D$$

for all i large enough for some finite constant D. Let $\epsilon > 0$ and choose $a^* \in C_c^\infty(U)$ such that $||a^* - a||_{C(U)} < \epsilon/D$. The standard approximation technique yields

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\int_U \varphi\,\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi_i) - \int_U \varphi\,\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi)\right| = \left|\int_U \varphi\, a_i\, J_{\phi_i} - \int_U \varphi\, a\, J_\phi\right| \\
&\quad\le \left|\int_U \varphi\,(a_i - a)J_{\phi_i}\right| + \left|\int_U \varphi\,(a - a^*)J_{\phi_i}\right| + \left|\int_U \varphi\, a^*(J_{\phi_i} - J_\phi)\right| \\
&\quad + \left|\int_U \varphi\,(a^* - a)J_\phi\right| \le ||a_i - a||_{C(U)} \int_U \varphi\, J_{\phi_i} + ||a - a^*||_{C(U)} \int_U \varphi\, J_{\phi_i} \\
&\quad + \left|\int_U \varphi\, a^*(J_{\phi_i} - J_\phi)\right| + ||a^* - a||_{C(U)} \int_U \varphi\, J_\phi.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit $i \to \infty$ shows that the right hand side is at most 2ϵ. Since ϵ was arbitrary, we have (3.10).

Finally, the distortion inequality follows from (3.9) and (3.10) since

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_U \varphi\, ||D\phi||^n &\le \liminf \int_U \varphi\, ||D\phi_i||^n \\
&\le K \lim \int_U \varphi\,\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi_i) = K \int_U \varphi\,\mathrm{Det}\,(D\phi)
\end{aligned}$$

for all positive test functions φ. □

In this section we studied the basic properties of Riemannian quasiregular mappings. We proceed to study how Riemannian quasiregular mappings act on the space of conformal structures.

4. Invariant conformal structure of a quasiconformal group

We apply the Riemannian definition of quasiconformal mappings and the results of the previous sections. We study the action of a group of K-quasiconformal mappings on the space of Riemannian metrics on a manifold. The result is a generalization of a result by Tukia [25, Thm. F]:

Theorem. Let G be quasiconformal group of mappings $\phi : U \to U$, U open in $\mathbb{R}^n \cup \{\infty\}$. Then there is a G-invariant conformal structure μ on U.

A quasiconformal group consists of quasiconformal mappings with a same quasiconformal factor K. A G-invariant conformal structure of a quasiconformal group on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is a measurable symmetric positive definite matrix field $\mu(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ such that all the mappings of the group G satisfies a.e. the Beltrami equation:

$$D\phi(x)^T \mu(\phi(x)) D\phi(x) = J_\phi(x)^{2/n} \mu(x),\ \phi \in G.$$

The determinant of the conformal structure μ is normalized to 1.

On a Riemannian manifold (M, g), we define a *conformal structure* to be a Riemannian metric whose g-invariant determinant equals 1 a.e. We do not assume other regularity assumptions on conformal structures other than measurability. Equivalently, a conformal structure can be understood as a measurable Riemannian metric whose volume form equals a.e. that of g (cf. [15]). A conformal structure h is an *invariant conformal structure* for a quasiconformal group G if every mapping of the group is conformal with respect to h:

$$\phi^* h = c\, h \text{ a.e. on } M, \ \phi \in G.$$

Here the conformal factor $c = c_\phi$ is positive a.e. and can be solved by taking the determinant of the equation:

$$c = \mathrm{Det}_h\, (\phi^* h)^{1/n} = \mathrm{Det}_g\, (\phi^* g)^{1/n} \equiv \mathrm{Det}_g\, (D\phi)^{2/n}\, .$$

Here the second equality holds by the assumption that the invariant determinant of h equals 1. We prove the following theorem that generalizes Tukia's result to general Riemannian manifolds in the countable case.

Theorem 4.1. Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold with a continuous Riemannian metric g and let G be a countable quasiconformal group on M. Then there is a measurable Riemannian metric h such that the equation

$$\phi^* h = c\, h$$

holds a.e. on M for all mappings ϕ in the group G. Here c depends on ϕ. The volume form of h equals that of g a.e.

Conformal structures are sections of the bundle $\mathcal{S}$ of positive definite symmetric 2-covariant tensors on M whose g-invariant determinant equals one. The bundle $\mathcal{S}$ admits a special geometry that we employ in the proof of the above theorem.

4.1. **The bundle $\mathcal{S}$.** Let (M, g) be a Riemannian manifold and $T^2_0 M$ the bundle of its 2-covariant tensors, the tensors with two lower indices. We consider the subset $\mathcal{S}$ of $T^2_0 M$ that consists of symmetric positive definite tensors A whose invariant determinant

$$\mathrm{Det}\,(A) = \det\left(g^{-1} A\right)$$

equals one. We give $\mathcal{S}$ a fiber bundle structure over M, which will have the following properties. The fibers of $\mathcal{S}$ are naturally diffeomorphic to the manifold $\mathcal{P}$ of positive definite symmetric determinant one matrices. A transition function of the bundle $\mathcal{S}$ can be taken to be a mapping from an open subset of M to the set of orthogonal matrices $O(n)$. That is, the structure group of $\mathcal{S}$ is $O(n)$. The construction of the fiber bundle here follows an accessible introduction to fiber bundles of [5].

Let us start by constructing local trivializations for $\mathcal{S}$. For this, choose a (continuous) orthonormal coframe $\{e^i\}$ on an open subset U of M. We can write an element $A \in T^2_0 U \cap \mathcal{S}$ as

$$A = A_{ij} e^i \otimes e^j.$$

Here the components A_{ij} define a positive definite symmetric matrix. In an orthonormal coframe, it also holds that $\det\,(A) = \det\left(g^{-1} A\right) = \mathrm{Det}\,(A) = 1$. Thus A can be identified with a matrix of the manifold $\mathcal{P}$. A local trivialization is a mapping

$$\psi : \pi^{-1} U \to U \times \mathcal{P}, \quad A \mapsto (\pi(A), A_{ij}), \tag{4.1}$$

where π is the restriction of the bundle projection $T^2_0 M \to M$ to $\mathcal{S} \to M$.

If $(\tilde{\psi}, V)$ is another trivialization corresponding to an orthonormal coframe $\{\tilde{e}^i\}$, we have a representation for $A \in \pi^{-1}(U \cap V)$ as

$$A = \tilde{A}_{ij}\tilde{e}^i \otimes \tilde{e}^j.$$

Since any two orthonormal basis are related by an orthogonal transformation, it follows that

$$A = \tilde{A}_{ij}\tilde{e}^i \otimes \tilde{e}^j = \tilde{A}_{ij}(he^i) \otimes (he^j) = \tilde{A}_{ij}h^i_k e^k \otimes h^j_l e^l,$$

where $h = (h^i_j) \in O(n)$ is an orthogonal matrix. Therefore, the matrices (A_{ij}) and $(\tilde{A}_{ij})$ representing the same $A \in \mathcal{S}$ are related by

$$A = h^T \tilde{A} h. \tag{4.2}$$

A transition function c_{UV} at $p \in U \cap V$ is a diffeomorphism of $\mathcal{P}$. By the calculation above, we have

$$c_{UV}(p)[A] = h(p)^T A h(p),$$

where $h : U \cap V \to O(n)$. Thus $\mathcal{S}$ is an $O(n)$ fiber bundle over (M, g) with fibers diffeomorphic to $\mathcal{P}$. We call $\mathcal{P}$ the *typical fiber* of $\mathcal{S}$ and a fiber $\pi^{-1}(p)$ over $p \in M$ is denoted by $\mathcal{S}_p$.

The set $\mathcal{P}$ of positive definite symmetric matrices with determinant 1 is a smooth manifold. It can be identified with

$$SL(n)/SO(n).$$

We equip $\mathcal{P}$ with a Riemannian metric $g^{\mathcal{P}}$ defined by

$$g^{\mathcal{P}}_A(X, Y) := \operatorname{tr}\left(A^{-1}XA^{-1}Y\right), \quad A \in \mathcal{P}, \quad X, Y \in T_A\mathcal{P}.$$

The bilinear symmetric form $g^{\mathcal{P}}$ is indeed a Riemannian metric. The positive definiteness can be seen by writing

$$g^{\mathcal{P}}_A(X, X) = \operatorname{tr}\left(A^{-1}XA^{-1}X\right) = ||A^{-1/2}XA^{-1/2}||^2_{HS}.$$

Here $|| \cdot ||_{HS}$ is the usual Hilbert-Schmidt norm of matrices. The equality follows from the fact that positive definite symmetric matrices have symmetric square roots and the fact that tangent vectors of symmetric matrices are symmetric.

The Riemannian metric $g^{\mathcal{P}}$ is invariant under the action

$$Z[A] = |\det(Z)|^{-2/n} Z^T A Z, \quad Z \in GL(n), \ A \in \mathcal{P}$$

of the general linear group $GL(n)$. Geometrically $(\mathcal{P}, g^{\mathcal{P}})$ is a complete, simply connected, globally symmetric Riemannian manifold of negative curvature [25, 9, 12].

The geometry of $\mathcal{P}$ extends naturally to the fibers of $\mathcal{S}$. Let us first construct a fiber metric for $\mathcal{S}$. A fiber metric of a fiber bundle is a Riemannian metric for each fiber $\pi^{-1}(p)$. It is an inner product for tangent vectors $X, Y \in T_A\pi^{-1}(p)$, where $A \in \pi^{-1}(p)$.

For the construction of the fiber metric, let $p \in M$, $A \in \pi^{-1}(p)$ and $X, Y \in T_A\pi^{-1}(p)$. By definition, tangent vectors X and Y of $T_A\pi^{-1}(p)$ are given by paths $A_1(t)$ and $A_2(t)$ through A in $\pi^{-1}(p)$. In a local trivialization, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_1(t) &= (\pi(\pi^{-1}(p)), A_{1ij}(t)) = (p, A_{ij} + t\dot{A}_{1ij}(0) + \mathcal{O}(t^2)) \\ A_2(t) &= (\pi(\pi^{-1}(p)), A_{2ij}(t)) = (p, A_{ij} + t\dot{A}_{2ij}(0) + \mathcal{O}(t^2)). \end{aligned}$$

We define an inner product for X and Y using the local trivialization as

$$\langle X, Y\rangle_A := \operatorname{tr}\left(A^{-1}\dot{A}_1(0)A^{-1}\dot{A}_2(0)\right). \tag{4.3}$$

It is the $g^{\mathcal{P}}$-inner product of the representation matrices.

The inner product of (4.3) is well defined. If $\tilde{A}, \tilde{A}_1(t)$ and $\tilde{A}_2(t)$ correspond to another trivialization, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A^{-1} &= (h^T\tilde{A}h)^{-1} = h^{-1}\tilde{A}^{-1}h^{-T} \\ \dot{A}_1(0) &= h^T\dot{\tilde{A}}_1(0)h \\ \dot{A}_2(0) &= h^T\dot{\tilde{A}}_2(0)h \end{aligned}$$

yielding

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X, Y\rangle_A &= \operatorname{tr}\left(\left(h^{-1}\tilde{A}^{-1}h^{-T}\right)\left(h^T\dot{\tilde{A}}_1(0)h\right)\left(h^{-1}\tilde{A}^{-1}h^{-T}\right)\left(h^T\dot{\tilde{A}}_2(0)h\right)\right) \\ &= \operatorname{tr}\left(\tilde{A}^{-1}\dot{\tilde{A}}_1(0)\tilde{A}^{-1}\dot{\tilde{A}}_2(0)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the definition of the inner product calculated in different local trivializations of $\pi^{-1}U$ and $\pi^{-1}V$ agree in the overlap of U and V. Fibers of $\mathcal{S}$ are isometric to the typical fiber $(\mathcal{P}, g^{\mathcal{P}})$.

We denote the fiber metric by $g^{\mathcal{V}}$, where $\mathcal{V}$ indicates that it is an inner product for the *vertical vectors* of $\mathcal{S}$. The fiber distance $d^{\mathcal{V}}$ is induced by the fiber metric $g^{\mathcal{V}}$. In a local trivialization it holds, with a slight abuse of notation, that

$$d^{\mathcal{V}}(A, B) = d^{\mathcal{P}}(A, B). \tag{4.4}$$

Here A and B on the right hand side denote the corresponding representations of A and B in the local trivialization. On the left hand side A and B are elements of a fiber of $\mathcal{S}$.

We define the determinant normalized pullback ϕ_N^* of a (weakly) differentiable mapping $\phi : M \to M$ with a non-vanishing determinant. It is the pullback of 2-covariant tensors whose determinant is normalized by the formula

$$\phi_N^* A := \frac{\phi^* A}{\operatorname{Det}_g(\phi^* g)^{1/n}}.$$

The invariant determinant of a tensor $A \in \mathcal{S}_\phi$ is preserved:

$$\operatorname{Det}_g(\phi_N^* A) = \frac{\det\left(g^{-1}D\phi^T A D\phi\right)}{\det\left(g^{-1}D\phi^T g|_\phi D\phi\right)} = \det\left(g^{-1}|_\phi A\right) = 1.$$

For each $p \in M$, the normalized pullback is a mapping from the fiber of $\mathcal{S}$ over $\phi(p)$ to the fiber of $\mathcal{S}$ over p.

Finally, we check that the normalized pullback is an isometry between the fibers $\mathcal{S}_{\phi(p)}$ and $\mathcal{S}_p$ of $\mathcal{S}$ equipped with the fiber metric $g^{\mathcal{V}}$ for any $p \in M$.

To simplify the notation, let us denote for a while $F = \phi_N^* : \mathcal{S}_{\phi(p)} \to \mathcal{S}_p$. With this notation, the isometry condition for ϕ_N^* reads

$$g^{\mathcal{V}}_{F(A)}(F_*X, F_*Y) = g^{\mathcal{V}}_A(X, Y), \tag{4.5}$$

where F_* is the pushforward of F and $X, Y \in T_A\mathcal{S}_{\phi(p)}$, $A \in \mathcal{S}_{\phi(p)}$. To verify this, choose paths $X(t)$ and $Y(t)$ tangents to X and Y at A respectively. We have

$$F_*X = \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0}\phi_N^*X(t) = \frac{d}{dt}|_{t=0}\frac{D\phi^T X(t) D\phi}{\det\left(g^{-1}\phi^* g\right)^{1/n}} = \frac{D\phi^T X D\phi}{\det\left(g^{-1}\phi^* g\right)^{1/n}}.$$

and similarly for Y. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} g^{\mathcal{V}}_{F(A)}(F_*X, F_*Y) &= \operatorname{tr}\left(\left(\frac{D\phi^T A D\phi}{\det\left(g^{-1}\phi^* g\right)^{1/n}}\right)^{-1} \frac{D\phi^T X D\phi}{\det\left(g^{-1}\phi^* g\right)^{1/n}}\right. \\ &\quad \times \left.\left(\frac{D\phi^T A D\phi}{\det\left(g^{-1}\phi^* g\right)^{1/n}}\right)^{-1} \frac{D\phi^T Y D\phi}{\det\left(g^{-1}\phi^* g\right)^{1/n}}\right) \\ &= \operatorname{tr}\left(A^{-1} X A^{-1} Y\right) = g^{\mathcal{V}}_A(X, Y) \end{aligned}$$

showing that the isometry condition holds.

4.2. **Proof of the theorem 4.1.** We prove Theorem 4.1. We study a *set valued section* E of $\mathcal{S}$ constructed from the normalized pullbacks of the mappings of the group G applied to the Riemannian metric g on M:

$$E(p) = \{\psi_N^* g(p) : \psi \in G\}.$$

In case the initial metric g happens to be an invariant conformal structure E is just the initial metric g. Otherwise the quasiconformality condition will restrict the values of E such that each set $E(p) \subset \mathcal{S}_p$ belongs to a unique smallest ball in the fiber metric of $\mathcal{S}$. The section of $\mathcal{S}$ consisting of the centers of the smallest balls is to be an invariant conformal structure. The proof is a generalization of the mentioned Tukia's result [25, Theorem F].

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let G be a countable K-quasiconformal group of homeomorphisms on a Riemannian manifold (M, g). The countability of G together with Theorem 3.4 imply that we can find a G-invariant measurable subset N of M which is of full measure and every $\phi \in G$ is differentiable on N with a non-vanishing Jacobian determinant. By the properties of N, we can define a set valued section $E : N \to \mathcal{S}$ by

$$E(p) = \{\psi_N^* g(p) : \psi \in G\}.$$

The Riemannian K-quasiconformality of the mappings in G will give a uniform bound for the diameter of each set $E(p) \subset \mathcal{S}_p$. To see this, let $p \in N$ and $\phi \in G$ be arbitrary, and choose a local trivialization of $\mathcal{S}$ on a neighborhood of p as in (4.1). We calculate the fiber distance between $\phi_N^* g$ and g at p. In a local trivialization, we have by (4.4) that

$$d^{\mathcal{V}}_p(g(p), \phi_N^* g(p)) = d^{\mathcal{P}}(g(p), \phi_N^* g(p)). \tag{4.6}$$

On the right hand side we have the distance of the representation matrices in the typical fiber $\mathcal{P}$.

In the local trivialization, the representation matrix of g is just the identity matrix I. Accordingly, the representation matrix of $\phi^* g$ equals that of $g^{-1}\phi^* g$. Therefore the equation (4.6) reads

$$d_p^{\mathcal{V}}(g(p), \phi_N^* g(p)) = d^{\mathcal{P}}(I, g^{-1}(p)\phi_N^* g(p)).$$

It is shown in [17, p. 27] that the distance of an element $A \in \mathcal{P}$ from the identity matrix I is given by

$$d^{\mathcal{P}}(I, A) = ((\log \mu_1)^2 + \cdots + (\log \mu_n)^2)^{1/2},$$

where μ_i are the eigenvalues of A. Let us denote by μ_i the eigenvalues of $g^{-1}(p)\phi_N^* g(p)$. We observed in (3.1) that the ratio of the largest and smallest eigenvalue of $g^{-1}\phi^* g$ is bounded by $n^n K^2$. Of course, the same bound holds for all the ratios λ_i/λ_j of the eigenvalues λ_i of $g^{-1}\phi^* g$, $i, j = 1, \ldots, n$. We have

$$\mu_i^n = \frac{\lambda_i^n}{\lambda_1 \cdots \lambda_n} \leq (n^n K^2)^n$$

and it follows that

$$d_p^{\mathcal{V}}(g(p), \phi_N^* g(p) = ((\log \mu_1)^2 + \cdots + (\log \mu_n)^2)^{1/2} \leq n^{1/2} \log n^n K^2.$$

Since $\phi \in G$ and $p \in M$ were arbitrary, the diameter of each set $E(p) \subset \mathcal{S}_p$ is bounded by $2n^{1/2} \log n^n K^2$ independently of p.

Let us then show that E is invariant under the normalized pullbacks of the mappings in the group G. Normalized pullbacks satisfy a product rule

$$\psi_N^* \circ \phi_N^* = (\phi \circ \psi)_N^*,$$

since the chain rule of differentiation (3.8) holds and consequently

$$\mathrm{Det}_g\,(\phi^* g)\,|_\psi \mathrm{Det}_g\,(\psi^* g) = \mathrm{Det}_g\,((\phi \circ \psi)^* g)\,.$$

By this product rule and the group property of G, we see that

$$(\phi_N^* E)(p) = \{\phi_N^*(\psi_N^* g)(p) : \psi \in G\} = \{(\psi \circ \phi)_N^* g(p) : \psi \in G\} = E(p),$$

for all $\phi \in G$ showing the invariance of E. In this sense, E can be viewed as a set valued solution to the problem of finding an invariant conformal structure for G.

It is shown in [25] that each bounded set of $\mathcal{P}$ belongs to a unique smallest ball. Since the fibers of $\mathcal{S}$ are isometric to $\mathcal{P}$, it follows that each $E(p)$ belongs to a unique smallest ball. We denote by h the section formed from the centers of the smallest balls.

We have seen that E is invariant under normalized pullbacks of the group and recall from (4.5) that the normalized pullback is an isometry between the fibers of $\mathcal{S}$. Thus the unique smallest balls, and in particular their centers, are mapped to each other by normalized pullbacks. Accordingly,

$$\phi_N^* h(p) = h(p),$$

for every $p \in N$ and $\phi \in G$. That is

$$\phi^* h = c\,h \text{ a.e. on } M$$

with $d\mu_g$ equaling a.e. $d\mu_h$. Here $c = \mathrm{Det}_g\,(\phi^* g)^{1/n}$.

It remains to show that h is measurable. This follows from exactly the same argument as in the proof of Tukia's theorem [25, Theorem F]. Let

$G = \{\phi_0, \phi_1, \ldots\}$ and approximate E by $E_j(p) = \{\phi_{iN}^* g : i \leq j\}$. Consider h_j to be the image of the mapping H, which maps E_j to the section constructed from the centers of unique smallest balls. Since H is continuous in the Hausdorff metric, it follows that each h_j is measurable and that $h_j \to h$ as $j \to \infty$. Hence h is measurable. $\square$

Acknowledgements. The author is supported by Finnish National Graduate School in Mathematics and its Applications. The author would like to thank Kirsi Peltonen for helpful suggestions.

References

[1] T. Aubin, Some nonlinear problems in Riemannian geometry, Springer-Verlag, (1998).

[2] M. Bonk and J. Heinonen, *Quasiregular mapping and cohomology*, Acta Mathematica, **186** (2001).

[3] B. Chow and P. Lu and L. Ni, Hamilton's Ricci flow, American Mathematical Society, (2006).

[4] S. Donaldson and D. Sullivan, *Quasiconformal 4-manifolds*, Acta Mathematica, **163** (1989).

[5] T. Frankel, The geometry of physics: an introduction, Cambridge University Press, (1997).

[6] P. Hajlasz and T. Iwaniec and J. Malý and J. Onninen, *Weakly differentiable mappings between manifolds*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., **192** (2008).

[7] P. Hajlasz, *Sobolev mappings between manifolds and metric spaces*, Sobolev spaces in mathematics. I, Int. Math. Ser. (N. Y.), **8**, Springer, (2009), 185–222.

[8] J. Heinonen and P. Koskela, *Definitions of quasiconformality*, Inventiones Mathematicae, **120** (1995).

[9] S. Helgason, Differential geometry, Lie groups and symmetric spaces, Academic Press, (1978).

[10] T. Iwaniec and G. Martin, Geometric function theory and non-linear analysis, Oxford University Press, (2001).

[11] T. Iwaniec and G. Martin, *Quasiregular Semigroups*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Math., **21** (1996).

[12] J. Jost, Nonpositive Curvature: Geometric and Analytic Aspects, Birkhäuser, (1997).

[13] J. Jost, Riemannian geometry and geometric analysis (6th ed.), Springer, (2011).

[14] E. H. Lieb and M. Loss, Analysis, American Mathematical Society, (2001).

[15] T. Liimatainen, *Optimal Riemannian metric for a volumorphism and a mean ergodic theorem in complete global Alexandrov nonpositively curved spaces*, AMS Contemporary Mathematics (to appear), arXiv:1110.0639.

[16] T. Liimatainen and M. Salo, *n-harmonic coordinates and regularity of conformal mappings*, (2012)

[17] H. Maass, *Siegel's modular forms and Dirichlet series*, Springer-Verlag, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **216** (1971).

[18] L. Mirsky, *The norms of adjugate and inverse matrices*, Arch. Math. (Basel), **7**, (1956).

[19] G. D. Mostow, *Quasi-conformal mappings in n-space and the rigidity of hyperbolic space forms*, Publications Mathmatiques de l'IHS, **34** (1968).

[20] A. Pierzchalski, *Ricci curvature and quasiconformal deformations of a Riemannian manifold*, Manuscripta Mathematica, **66** (1990).

[21] Yu. G. Reshetnyak, Space mappings with bounded distortion, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, **73** (1989).

[22] S. Rickman, Quasiregular mappings, Springer-Verlag, (1993).

[23] R. Schoen and K. Uhlenbeck, *A regularity theory for harmonic maps*, J. Differential Geom., **17**, (1982), 307–335.

[24] R. Schoen and K. Uhlenbeck, *Boundary regularity and the Dirichlet problem for harmonic maps*, J. Differential Geom., **18**, (1983), 253–268.

[25] P. Tukia, *On quasiconformal groups*, Journal d'Analyse Mathmatique, **46** (1986).
[26] J. Väisälä, Lectures on n-dimensional quasiconformal mappings, Springer-Verlag, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **229** (1971).

Department of Mathematics and Systems Analysis, Aalto University, P.O. Box 11100 FI-00076 Aalto Finland, +358 9 470 23044
E-mail address: `tony.liimatainen@aalto.fi`